

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) as not showing every feature of the claims. The Examiner rejected claim 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as indefinite. The Examiner also rejected claims 28-31, 33-38, and 40 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Tucker (U.S. Patent No. 6,500,079). Additionally, the Examiner rejected claims 32 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Tucker as applied above and further in view of Official Notice.

The Applicants address each of these objections and rejections and record below.

The Objections to the Drawings:

The Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) as not showing every feature of the claims. The Examiner required corrected drawings or that certain features in claim 36 be amended from the claims. The Applicants cancelled claim 36 without prejudice. It is therefore submitted that the objections to the drawings have been cured.

The Section 112 Claim Rejections:

The Examiner rejected claim 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner indicated that the term “offset” is vague and indefinite. The Applicants also cancelled claim 36 without prejudice. It is thus submitted that the section 112 claim rejections have been overcome and should be withdrawn.

The Section 102(e) Claim Rejections:

The Examiner also rejected claims 28-31, 33-38, and 40 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Tucker (U.S. Patent No. 6,500,079). Claims 28 and 34 have been amended to clarify the fact that the exterior surface of the handle has a generally uniform outer diameter. This feature is not taught or suggested by the Tucker reference. To the extent there are variations in the thickness of the handle in the Tucker reference, they extend from the exterior surface of the handle (see e.g. Figs. 4, 5, 6a, 6b, and 7). As such, the handle in the Tucker reference does not teach a handle with a generally uniform outer

diameter. Specifically, with respect to the view in Figure 6a, referred to by the Examiner, the ribs that are attached to the shaft are formed as overlays 502.

It is therefore submitted that independent claims 28 and 34 are allowable over the Tucker reference as well as all other art of record. Accordingly, it is submitted that all pending claims are in condition for allowance

Conclusion:

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that all of the claims remaining in the case, namely claims 28-35, are in proper form and patentably distinguish from the prior art. Accordingly, allowance of the claims and passage of the application to issuance are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

ARTZ & ARTZ, P.C.


John S. Artz
Reg. No. 36,431
28333 Telegraph Road, Ste. 250
Southfield, MI 48034

Attorney for Applicants

Date: March 26, 2007